

that 28 million married working couples pay higher taxes today just because they are married? Is it right that our Tax Code charges a married working couple with two incomes more in taxes than an identical couple with identical incomes living together outside of marriage?

I think we all agree that that is wrong. This House made a bipartisan commitment, by adopting the 90-10, plan not only to save Social Security, but also to work to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

When I think of Social Security, I think of my mom and dad but. When I think of the marriage tax penalty. I think of my sister, Pat, and brother-in-law Rich, a school teacher and a farmer back home in Sheldon, Illinois who are just like 28 million other married working couples. They suffer the marriage tax penalty.

Under our legislation, by doubling the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of a single filer, raising it from \$6900 to \$8300, we save 28 million married working couples \$243 under the 90-10 plan. That saves Social Security and helps eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Back home in the south suburbs, towns like Joliet, Illinois, \$243, that is a car payment, that is a couple months' worth of day care for a family with kids that need to be in day care while mom and dad are forced to go to work just to pay the taxes. That is a big victory.

I am also proud that not only does doubling the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of a single filer save \$243 but it also simplifies the Tax Code, one of the other goals of our Republican Congress. By simplifying our Tax Code, in fact, our marriage tax relief not only saves \$243 each for 28 million couples, but we allow 6 million married working couples to no longer have to file a schedule A. They will only need to file a schedule 1040 EZ, meaning they will no longer need to itemize. We are simplifying their tax filing process.

Mr. Speaker, that is a big victory. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep raising this ogre. They always say somehow by working to eliminate the marriage tax penalty that somehow because you are doing that you are somehow hurting the Social Security trust fund.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, two weeks ago we asked a representative of the Social Security Administration, the deputy commissioner, and her name, Judy Chesser, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) asked Judith Chesser, he asked her, now, as a result of the tax bill, the tax cuts contained in the 90-10 plan, that the committee was planning to vote out, will there be any impact on the Social Security trust fund. Judith Chesser said, absolutely, no.

The 90-10 plan is good for families back home. It helps farmers in Illinois.

It helps small business people in Illinois. Helps those who want to send their kids off to college. We eliminate the marriage tax penalty for a majority of those who suffer it. The bottom line is, we also save Social Security by setting aside \$1.4 trillion.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m.

□ 1633

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EWING) at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3874, CHILD NUTRITION AND WIC REAUTHORIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3874) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with increased access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations and improve program management, to extend certain authorities contained in those Acts through fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLING, RIGGS, CASTLE, CLAY and MARTINEZ.

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of sections 2, 101, 104(b), 106, 202(c) and 202(o) of the House bill, and sections 101, 111, 114, 203(c), 203(r), and titles III and IV of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SMITH of Oregon, GOODLATTE, and STENHOLM.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2073, JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY ACT OF 1998

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with rule XX and by direction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, with the concurrence of the

Committee on the Judiciary, I move to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2073) to authorize appropriations for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my motion. The bill addresses the problem of juvenile crime in this country. We all know that juvenile crime is not going to go away on its own.

For two Congresses we have attempted to address the problem of juvenile crime through legislation supporting accountability and prevention programs. Yet we have not produced a final bill. While the states have their own initiatives to combat juvenile crime, they rely on the resources we have provided them through laws such as the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, which expired in 1996. Today's action is merely an effort to get to conference with the Senate. H.R. 3 passed the House by a vote of 286 to 123. H.R. 1818 passed the House by a vote of 413 to 14.

We need to address juvenile crime through a two-pronged approach. First, we must send a message to our youth that we will not tolerate their involvement in criminal activity. We can do this through the imposition of appropriate punishment for each crime they commit.

Second, we need to work with the youth at risk of committing juvenile acts and those who have already been in touch with the juvenile justice system to prevent their involvement in criminal activities.

I realize that some of the body have problems with certain of the provisions of the bill, that it is not perfect legislation. However this motion to go to conference is the way to address these concerns. I believe the conferees will have a much better chance to produce an approach to address the problems of juvenile crime with which we can all agree. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS).

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I will be brief, since I know we promised the minority we would not have any extended debate on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise to say that I am particularly pleased in the waning days of this Congress, the 105th Congress, in our country's history, we are going to be able to go to conference with the Senate on hopefully a comprehensive approach to combating juvenile crime.

As the chairman mentioned, there are two measures that have passed the House, both with strong bipartisan support; H.R. 3, the Committee on the Judiciary bill, and H.R. 1818, the bill that